

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this response, claim 1 has been amended. No claims have been deleted or added. Consequently, claims 8, 11-25 and 28-29 remain under consideration. Support for the amendments to claims 1 can be found at page 3, lines 23-26. Therefore, no new matter has been added. Amendment of a claim is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any subject matter.

The Examiner's rebuttal in the Official Action of 5 August 2005 has been carefully considered, however, the Examiner is respectfully asked to reconsider the actual relevance of the disclosures in Dymetman, both in respect of the claim rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103. The disclosures in Dymetman represent a series of proposals and suggested ideas which are supported with virtually no enabling disclosures, information or teachings whatsoever. For the purposes of support for the claim rejection, the Examiner must provide citations giving full disclosures of the information and teachings in the current claimed invention in a manner providing full disclosure of all the features of the current claimed invention, including teachings that support the Examiner's position that the claimed subject matter has previously been presented into the public domain in a manner amounting to full disclosure so as to deprive the current claimed invention of novelty or lack of obviousness.

In particular, the rejections under 35 USC 103, must rely on citations that provide a nexus of technology but also, rely on citations that provide clear endeavours aimed at solving the same problems addressed in the current claimed invention. Not only must the cited documentation be addressed similar issues and be endeavouring to solve similar problems to that of the current applicants, the teachings and directions provided in the cited documentation, must provide clear, unambiguous and **unmistakable directions** to the addressee to solve the problems addressed by the applicant in a manner not requiring the exercise of inventive faculty by the addressee.

It is respectfully submitted that the Dymetman disclosures are wholly deficient in this respect, insofar as they provide only a sketch book of proposals and ideas, with no supporting enablement, teachings, or any guidance whatsoever as to how to execute and solve the problems carefully and clearly addressed by the current applicant in the claimed invention. The Examiner is therefore respectfully asked to reconsider the rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103 and recommend the application for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant has fully responded to each matter of substance raised in the Office Action and believes that the case is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application is therefore courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any requests, questions or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762